DETERMINANTS OF GOOD ORAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF ADVANCED PROGRAM STUDENTS' CLASSROOM ORAL PRESENTATION PERFORMANCE AT THAI NGUYEN UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

*Vũ Kiều Hạnh[1, *]*

[1] Thai Nguyen University of Agriculture and Forestry

[*] Email: vukieuhanh@tuaf.edu.vn

Article info

Abstract:

The study was conducted at Thai Nguyen University of Agriculture and Forestry, Academic year 2019-2020. Descriptive research design was used in the study. Mean, standard deviation and linear regression analysis were statistical tools employed in finding the mean level of the determinants of good Oral Communication of Advanced program (AP) students in terms of exposure to English language, grammar and vocabulary, mastery, passion in English and self-confidence; the mean level of students' Classroom Oral Presentation performance in terms of diction, delivery, intonation, pronunciation and voice projection; and the significant effect of exposure to English language, grammar and vocabulary, mastery, passion in English and self-confidence to students' classroom oral presentation performance.

1. Introduction

Currently, oral presentation is one of the basic and important skills in the students' studies. This skill is very significant for students and in particular those who take foreign languages because learning a foreign language requires learners' development of confidence and enhances initiative. Additionally, it is a skill valuable for application in future jobs and of course in daily life; especially when English is nowadays considered as a global language. It is a bridge which helps people from different countries; different languages understand each other, since the main purpose of language is communicating. Through the use of English, people can see the view of others; can exchange ideas, opinions and thoughts.

Presentation skills are important and crucial for students. It is applied to many fields of life in studies, job interview, and teaching. Oral presentations represent an opportunity for developing real-world communications as well as leadership skills [2]. Strong soft skill as oral presentation skill is an essential skill to obtain a job and thereby succeed in job career at workplace [3]. Owning good presentation skills means that students have good communication skills; they must have confidence when presenting something in front of a crowd; and, they can use language effectively in certain situations.

However, the problem is that many students, especially second-year students struggled much

when delivering presentations. It takes students lot of time practicing if they want to be skillful in it. Most students lack the basic skills required in oral presentation and can't grasp the importance of it. These are the deficiencies why students have difficulty and experiencing confusion when giving a presentation [4]. Moreover, many students are still unaware of the importance of presentation skills for current learning and for their jobs in the future.

In Vietnam, however, this problem is even more serious. Aside from the term of practicing, Vietnamese students always have to face with many other difficulties when giving oral presentations. It cannot be denied that Vietnamese students are very good in English theoretical exercises they have mastery of grammar rules and vocabulary items yet, there is an in ability to use it as a medium in classroom oral presentation. Therefore, the problem is not lack of grammar or vocabulary knowledge [5].

This study is conducted to find out the main determinants relative to students' oral presentation, to address the problem with the aim to help improving the presentation skills of the students.

2. Subject and methodology

The respondents of the study were the AP students at Thai Nguyen University of Agriculture and Forestry, Academic year 2019-2020.

As there was assurance for validity of the major instrument to conduct an actual study, letters addressed to the principal of Thai Nguyen University of Agriculture and Forestry requesting permission to distribute the questionnaire to the eighty (80) student respondents.

When the approved letter was released, the researcher went to different classes to administer the questionnaire. With the most valued help of the teacher in each class, the researcher made possible the distribution to clarify questions that were found highly technical in nature by the actual respondents.

3. Findings

Level of the Determinant of Good Oral Communication of Second Year Students

Table 1. Level of Exposure to English language as one of the Determinants of Good Oral Communication

Item	Mean	SD	V.I
1.　　　 I read English newspapers, magazines.	3.20	1.04	ME
2.　　　 I listen to English programs on radio.	3.43	1.00	E
3.　　　 I watch English TV programs.	3.38	0.97	ME
4.　　　 I visit English web pages on the internet.	3.13	0.93	ME
Overall	3.28	0.75	ME

Legend:　　　Remarks　　　　　　　Verbal Interpretation

4.21-5.00　　Very much/Always　　　Highly exposed (HE)

3.41-4.20　　Much/Often　　　　　　Exposed (E)

2.61-3.40　　Moderate/Sometimes　　Moderately exposed (ME)

1.81-2.60　　Little/Seldom　　　　　Less exposed (LE)

1.00-1.80　　Not at all/Never　　　　Not exposed (NE)

As evident in table 1 showed that the learners are more exposed to English programs on radio English TV programs with a highest mean of 3.43. It was found that students tend to watch English program than reading English newspapers and magazines. The lowest mean score is 3.13 for English web pages on the internet which were shown by the standard deviation of 0.75 with verbally interpreted as *moderately exposed*. This can be supported by the fact that the social background of the learner has significant effect on the development of language skills.

Table 2. Level of Grammar and Vocabulary as determinants of Good Oral Communication

Item	Mean	SD	V.I.
1. It takes too much time to make every sentence grammatically and accurately correct.	3.38	1.07	MK
2. My English vocabulary knowledge is enough for me to express all what I want to say.	3.10	0.77	MK
3. I can manage to pay attention on grammar and vocabulary at the same time.	3.15	0.83	MK
4. I know grammar patterns and vocabulary items which have some things in common.	3.33	0.69	MK
Overall	3.24	0.56	MK

Legend:	Remarks	Verbal Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Very much/Always	Highly knowledgeable (HK)
3.41-4.20	Much/Often	Knowledgeable (K)
2.61-3.40	Moderate/Sometimes	Moderately Knowledgeable (MK)
1.81-2.60	Little/Seldom	Less knowledgeable (LK)
1.00-1.80	Not at all/Never	Not knowledgeable (NK)

As observed from table 2 respondents' grammar and vocabulary received mean scores of 3.38, 3.10, 3.15 and 3.33 respectively with standard deviations of 1.07, 0.77, 0.83 and 0.69. Based on their overall mean which was 3.24 they got *moderate/sometimes* as remark and *moderately knowledgeable* as verbal interpretation.

Table 3. Level of Mastery as one of the determinants of Good Oral Communication

Item	Mean	SD	V.I.
1. I am determined to what I'm about to say to avoid mistake during presentation.	3.08	0.76	MO
2. I see to it that I remember the corrections that my teacher checked to avoid the same mistakes.	3.45	0.84	O
3. I keep in mind the important information that I'm about to share in my oral presentation.	3.33	1.06	MO
4. I am determined to what I will present from the most important to the least important so that others may understand what I mean to say.	3.23	0.89	MO
Overall	3.27	0.51	MO

Legend: **Remarks**

  4.21-5.00   Very much/Always

  3.41-4.20   Much/Often

  2.61-3.40   Moderate/Sometimes

  1.81-2.60   Little/Seldom

Table 3 presents the mastery of students when giving presentations. A mean of 3.08 came out in item number one which pertains to avoiding mistakes during pretention of students followed by 3.45 mean that students remember the corrections of teacher and avoid the same mistakes, a 3.33 mean for the item number three that students keep the important information in their mind and then share in their oral presentation, and a 3.23 mean was gathered in students' order of presentation from the most important to the least important with 0.76, 0.84, 1.06 and 0.89 as standard deviation.

Table 4. Level of Passion in English as one of the determinants of Good Oral Communication

Item	Mean	SD	V.I.
1. I attend all my English classes.	3.68	1.04	I
2. I volunteer to answer all the questions of my teachers.	2.93	0.96	MI
3. I practice actively in all activities in classrooms.	3.50	0.90	I
4. I ask my teacher for help whenever I have any question in classroom.	3.23	1.14	MI
Overall	3.33	0.71	MI

Legend: **Remarks**   **Verbal Interpretation**

  4.21-5.00   Very much/Always   Highly interested (HI)

  3.41-4.20   Much/Often   Interested (I)

  2.61-3.40   Moderate/Sometimes   Moderately interested (MI)

  1.81-2.60   Little/Seldom   Less interested (LI)

  1.00-1.80   Not at all/Never   Not interested (NI)

As can be seen from table 4, the respondent's passion in English had an overall mean of 3.33 and a standard deviation of 0.71 with *moderately interested* verbal interpretation. The highest mean scores of 3.68 and 3.50 among the items discloses that motivated students are likely to learn more and learn more quickly than students who are less motivated. In a particular learning situation, students who are less motivated are likely to lose their attention, misbehave and cause discipline problems. On the contrary, the results also mentions that students who are more highly motivated will participate actively and pay more attention to a certain learning task or activity.

Table 5. Level of Self-confidence as one of the determinants of Good Oral Communication

Item	Mean	SD	V.I.
1. I feel relaxed when giving presentation in front of my classmates.	3.38	0.97	MC
2. I am free from worries when giving presentation in front of my teacher in the	3.23	0.76	MC

Item	Mean	SD	V.I.
classroom because she is approachable.			
3. I am optimistic that I will succeed in my oral presentations.	3.20	0.75	MC
4. I feel that my classmates think that I am trying to show that I am better than them.	2.85	1.09	MC
Overall	3.16	0.57	M C

Table 5 shows that students feel relaxed and free when giving presentation in front of the acquaintances such as their classmates and teachers which gathered mean are 3.38 and 3.23. They found that they are optimistic to have presentations successfully for it collected a mean of 3.20 followed by the lowest mean among the items which is 2.85 for the reason that students feel that their classmates think that they are trying to show that they are the better one.

Legend:	Remarks	Verbal Interpretation
4.21-5.00	Very much/Always	Highly confidence (HC)
3.41-4.20	Much/Often	Confidence (C)
2.61-3.40	Moderate/Sometimes	Moderately confidence (MC)
1.81-2.60	Little/Seldom	Less confidence (LC)
1.00-1.80	Not at all/Never	Not confidence (NC)

Level of Students' Classroom Oral Presentation Performance

The respondents of delivery, diction, intonation, pronunciation and voice projection are presented in tables 6 to 10.

Table 6. Level of students' classroom Oral Presentation Performance in Delivery

Item	Mean	SD	V.I.
1. I usually give presentation with eye contact for them to know that I know what I want to say.	3.25	0.89	A
2. I use eye contact because I'm communicating to the class.	3.15	0.86	A
3. I maintain eye contact most of time in my presentation but frequently return to notes.	3.15	0.73	A
4. I use gestures to convey meaning.	3.10	0.87	A
Overall	3.16	0.52	A

Legend:	Remarks
4.21-5.00	Very much/Always
3.41-4.20	Much/Often
2.61-3.40	Average
1.81-2.60	Little/Seldom
1.00-1.80	Not at all/Never

As evident from table 6, the respondent's delivery got an overall computed mean of 3.16 and a standard deviation of 0.52 with *average* verbal interpretation. Students give presentation with eye contact for others to know what they want to say which gathered a highest mean of 3.25. Students use eye contact to communicate to the class and they maintain eye contact most of time but frequently return to notes in their presentation which both gathered a mean of 3.15. The lowest 3.10 mean was given for student's using gestures to convey meaning with 0.89, 0.86, 0.73 and 0.87 as standard deviation and they are all interpreted as *average*.

Table 7. Level of students' classroom Oral Presentation Performance in Diction

Item	Mean	SD	V.I
1. I choose correct words in my presentation.	3.28	0.93	MO
2. I use variety of words in my presentation	3.10	0.77	MO
3. I can use a wide range of vocabulary in my presentation but still very few minor mistakes.	3.20	0.91	MO
4. I can use a wide range of vocabulary without any mistakes.	2.73	1.01	MO
Overall	3.08	0.59	MO

Legend: Remarks

4.21-5.00   Very much/Always

3.41-4.20   Much/Often

2.61-3.40   Moderate/Sometimes

1.81-2.60   Little/Seldom

Table 7 showed the respondent's diction had an overall mean of 3.08 and a standard deviation of 0.59 with *moderately observable* verbal interpretation. The item number one got the highest mean of 3.28 with 0.93 standard deviation; it shows students can choose the correct words in their presentation. Item number two with a 3.10 mean shows that students also can use variety of words. Although having a few minor mistakes, students still can use a wide range of vocabulary in their presentation and it is shown to be the third item with 3.20 mean. The last item got the least of mean which is 2.73, it deals with the ability of using vocabulary without mistakes of students.

Table 8. Level of students' classroom Oral Presentation Performance in Intonation

Item	Mean	SD	V.I.
1. I mumble, and use monotone or highly erratic voice inflection.	3.10	0.74	MO
2. I speak with low volume with little variation in tone.	2.90	0.87	MO
3. I speak with variation to avoid monotony.	3.10	0.89	MO
4. I speak with clearly using the rising and falling of voice when necessary.	3.18	0.92	MO
	3.07	0.49	MO

Legend: **Remarks**

4.21-5.00   Very much/Always

3.41-4.20   Much/Often

2.61-3.40   Moderate/Sometimes

1.81-2.60   Little/Seldom

As observed from table 8, the respondent's intonation got an overall computed mean of 3.07 and a standard deviation of 0.49 with *moderately observable* verbal interpretation. It shows students use monotone or erratic voice inflection, speak with low volume with little variation in tone, speak with variation to avoid monotony and speak with clearly using rising and falling of voice. The items receive mean scores of 3.10, 2.90, 3.10 and 3.18 and 3.07 respectively with standard deviations of 0.74, 0.87, 0.89, 0.92 and 0.49. Based on the scale, they are all interpreted as *moderately observable*.

Table 9. Level of students' classroom Oral Presentation Performance in Pronunciation

Item	Mean	SD	V.I.
1. I make clear pronunciation of the end sounds of English words.	3.33	0.99	A
2. I know exactly how to produce English sounds which do not occur in Vietnamese language sound system.	3.33	0.85	A
3. I produce English words with stress or even with no stress.	3.30	0.85	A
4. I miss some sounds in long words.	3.20	0.82	A
Overall	3.29	0.56	A

Legend: **Remarks**

4.21-5.00   Very much/Always

3.41-4.20   Much/Often

2.61-3.40   Average

1.81-2.60   Little/Seldom

1.00-1.80   Not at all/Never

As can be seen from table 9, the respondent's pronunciation had an overall mean of 3.29 and a standard deviation of 0.56 with *average* verbal interpretation. Table 9 shows that students can make clear pronunciation with the ending sounds and they know exactly how to produce English sounds which do not occur in mother language sound system which both gathered a mean of 3.33, students also can produce English words with stress or even with no stress for it collected a mean of 3.30 followed by the lowest mean among the items which is 3.20 for the missing of some sounds in long words.

Table 10. Level of Students' Classroom Oral Presentation Performance in Voice Projection

Item	Mean	SD	V.I
1. It is easy for me to say most terms correctly to be understood.	3.13	0.88	MO
2. I pronounce the words correctly in front of my classmates.	3.10	0.70	MO

Item	Mean	SD	V.I
3. My voice is loud and clear enough to be heard by the class.	3.08	0.91	MO
4. I know when to raise and lower my voice if necessary.	3.05	0.93	MO
Overall	3.09	0.58	MO

Legend: **Remarks**

4.21-5.00 Very much/Always

3.41-4.20 Much/Often

2.61-3.40 Moderate/Sometimes

1.81-2.60 Little/Seldom

As evident in table 10 showed the respondent's voice projection got an overall computed mean of 3.09 and a standard deviation of 0.58 with *moderately observable* verbal interpretation. Item number one which shows that students are easy to say most term correctly to understood got mean of 3.13, 3.10 was given to item number two which indicates that students pronounce the words correctly in front of their classmates, item number three shows that the voice of students are loud and clear enough to be heard by the class gathered 3.08 mean and a lowest mean 3.05 was given for the last item that students know when to raise and lower their voice.

There is significant relationship in the ratings given by the students on the determinants of Good Oral Communication to students' classroom Oral Presentation performance.

Effects of Self-confidence, Mastery, Grammar and vocabulary, Passion in English and Exposure to English language to students' Classroom Oral Presentation Performance

Table 11. Regression of Delivery on the Self-Confidence, Mastery, Grammar and Vocabulary, Passion in English, Exposure to English language.

Term	Coefficient	t	p	Remarks
Constant	1.544	3.33	0.001	-----
Self Confidence	-0.0355	-0.38	0.707	NS
Mastery	0.020	0.19	0.850	NS
Grammar and Vocabulary	0.0341	0.36	0.716	NS
Passion in English	0.0423	0.48	0.629	NS
Exposure to English Language	0.4454	5.98	<0.001	**Significant**

S=0.407 R^2=44.99% R^2(adj)=39.64% R^2(pred)=32.04%

Self-confidence had a coefficient of -0.0355 with the computed t of -0.38 and p-value of .707, interpreted as *no significant*; mastery got a coefficient of -0.020 with the computed t of 0.19 and p-value of .850 and was interpreted as *no significant*; grammar and vocabulary had a

coefficient of 0.0341 with the computed t of 0.36 and p-value of .716, interpreted as *no significant*; passion in English got a coefficient of 0.0423 with the computed t of 0.48 and p-value of .629 and was interpreted as *no significant*; exposure to English language had a coefficient of 0.4454 with the computed t of 5.98 and p-value < 0.001 (almost zero), interpreted as *significant*.

Table 12. Regression of Diction on the Self-Confidence, Mastery, Grammar and Vocabulary, Passion in English, Exposure to English language.

Term	Coefficient	t	p	Remarks
Constant	1.220	2.01	0.048	-----
Self Confidence	0.113	0.92	0.363	NS
Mastery	-0.070	-0.51	0.610	NS
Grammar and Vocabulary	0.020	0.16	0.872	NS
Passion in English	0.190	1.66	0.101	NS
Exposure to English Language	0.2521	2.59	0.012	**Significant**
S=0.532 R^2=26.65% R^2(adj)=19.52% R^2(pred)=5.08%				

Self-confidence had a coefficient of 0.113 with the computed t of 0.92 and p-value of .363, interpreted as *no significant*; mastery got a coefficient of -0.070 with the computed t of -0.51 and p-value of .610 and was interpreted as *no significant*; grammar and vocabulary had a coefficient of 0.020 with the computed t of 0.16 and p-value of .872, interpreted as *no significant*; passion in English got a coefficient of 0.190 with the computed t of 1.66 and p-value of .101 and was interpreted as *no significant*; exposure to English language had a coefficient of 0.2521 with the computed t of 2.59 and p-value of .012, interpreted as s*ignificant*.

Table 13. Regression of Intonation on the Self-Confidence, Mastery, Grammar and Vocabulary, Passion in English, Exposure to English language.

Term	Coefficient	t	p	Remarks
Constant	1.643	3.28	0.002	-----
Self Confidence	-0.113	-1.11	0.269	NS
Mastery	0.368	3.27	0.002	**Significant**
Grammar and Vocabulary	0.267	2.65	0.010	**Significant**
Passion in English	-0.0407	-0.43	0.667	NS
Exposure to English Language	0.0783	0.97	0.333	NS
S=0.439 R^2=26.92% R^2(adj)=19.81% R^2(pred)=8.78%				

Self-confidence had a coefficient of -0.113 with the computed *t* of -1.11 and p-value of 0.269, interpreted as *no significant*; mastery got a coefficient of 0.368 with the computed *t* of 3.27 and *p*-value of .002 and was interpreted as *significant*; grammar and vocabulary had a coefficient of 0.267 with the computed *t* of 2.65 and *p*-value of .010, interpreted as *significant*; passion in English got a coefficient of -0.0407 with the computed *t* of -0.43 and *p*-value of 0.667 and was interpreted as *no significant;* exposure to English language had a coefficient of 0.0783 with the computed *t* of 0.97 and *p*-value of .333, interpreted as *no significant*.

Table 14. Regression of Pronunciation on the Self-Confidence, Mastery, Grammar and Vocabulary, Passion in English, Exposure to English language.

Term	Coefficient	*t*	*p*	Remarks
Constant	0.788	1.82	0.073	-----
Self Confidence	0.1234	1.40	0.165	NS
Mastery	0.1142	1.18	0.244	NS
Grammar and Vocabulary	0.0589	0.67	0.502	NS
Passion in English	0.2438	3.00	0.004	**Significant**
Exposure to English Language	0.3203	4.61	<0.001	**Significant**
S=0.38 R^2=58.68% R^2(adj)=54.66% R^2(pred)=48.13%				

Self-confidence had a coefficient of 0.1234 with the computed *t* of -1.40 and *p*-value of 0.165, interpreted as *no significant*; mastery got a coefficient of -0.1142 with the computed *t* of 1.18 and *p*-value of .244 and was interpreted as *no significant*; grammar and vocabulary had a coefficient of 0.0589 with the computed *t* of 0.67 and *p*-value of .502, interpreted as *no significant*; passion in English got a coefficient of 0.2438 with the computed *t* of 3.00 and *p*-value of .004 and was interpreted as *significant*; exposure to English language had a coefficient of 0.3203 with the computed *t* of 4.61 and *p*-value < 0.001, interpreted as *significant*.

Table 15. Regression of Voice Projection on the Self-Confidence, Mastery, Grammar and Vocabulary, Passion in English, Exposure to English language.

Term	Coefficient	*t*	*p*	Remarks
Constant	2.663	4.67	<0.001	-----
Self Confidence	0.126	1.00	0.322	NS
Mastery	-0.165	-1.18	0.241	NS
Grammar and Vocabulary	-0.052	-0.42	0.677	NS
Passion in English	0.075	0.64	0.524	NS
Exposure to English Language	0.251	2.52	0.014	**Significant**
S=0.546 R^2=18.76% R^2(adj)=10.86% R^2(pred)=0.00%				

Self-confidence had a coefficient of 0.126 with the computed *t* of 1.00 and *p*-value of .322, interpreted as *no significant*; mastery got a coefficient of -0.165 with the computed *t* of -1.18 and *p*-value of .241 and was interpreted as *no significant*; grammar and vocabulary had a coefficient of -0.052 with the computed *t* of -0.42 and *p*-value of .677, interpreted as *no significant*; passion in English got a coefficient of 0.075 with the computed *t* of 0.64 and *p*-value of .524 and was interpreted as *no significant*; exposure to English language had a coefficient of 0.251 with the computed *t* of 2.52 and *p*-value of 0.014, interpreted as *significant.*

4. Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. It was found out that students' exposure to English language was significant determinant of students' presentation in term of voice projection, diction, delivery and pronunciation.

2. Students' passion in learning the English language predicts their skills in oral presentation performance in classroom.

3. For skills and intonation, there were two statistically significant Factors, grammar & vocabulary, and mastery.

Since only some of the factors significantly affect the students' oral classroom, therefore the null hypothesis is partially supported.

References

1. Adams, K. (2004). Modelling success: *Enhancing international postgraduate research students' self-efficacy for research seminar presentations.* Higher Education Research & Development, 23(2), 115-130.

2. A. Kanu and S. Durham (2016). *Processing Public Speaking: Perspectives in Information Production and Consumption.*

3. Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2001). The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

4. Derwin, Tracey M. et., al. (2018). *Second Language Accent and Pronunciation Teaching:* A Research-Based Approach

5. Dudley-Evans, T. (1998). Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach. Cambridge University Press.

NHỮNG YẾU TỐ QUYẾT ĐỊNH ĐẾN KỸ NĂNG GIAO TIẾP TỐT NHẰM NÂNG CAO KHẢ NĂNG THUYẾT TRÌNH CỦA SINH VIÊN CHƯƠNG TRÌNH TIÊN TIẾN TẠI TRƯỜNG ĐẠI HỌC NÔNG LÂM THÁI NGUYÊN

Vũ Kiều Hạnh

Thông tin bài viết

Tóm tắt

Nghiên cứu được tiến hành tại trường Đại học Nông Lâm Thái Nguyên, năm học 2019-2020. Phương pháp mô tả được sử dụng trong nghiên cứu này. Độ trung bình, độ lệch chuẩn và phân tích quy hồi tuyến tính là phương pháp thống kê được sử dụng để tìm ra mức độ trung bình của các yếu tố quyết định đến khả năng giao tiếp tốt của sinh viên chương tình tiên tiến xét về mặt tiếp xúc với tiếng Anh, ngữ pháp và từ vựng, sự thành thạo, niềm đam mê với tiếng Anh và sự tự tin; mức độ trung bình bài thuyết trình của sinh viên xét về mặt diễn đạt, trình bày, ngữ điệu, phát âm, và chiếu bằng giọng nói; và ảnh hưởng quan trọng của việc tiếp cận với tiếng Anh, ngữ pháp và từ vựng, sự thành thạo, niềm đam mê với tiếng Anh và sự tự tin trong việc trình bày bài thuyết trình của sinh viên.